

REMARKS

By entry of this amendment, claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1-4 and 10-14 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 15, 18 and 20-22 have been amended, and claim 23 is new. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 20, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 20-22 have been amended to overcome the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20-22 are definite.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5-9 and 15-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Zawadzki et al., U.S. Patent Application Patent No. 7,107,268 in view of Using Microsoft Excel 97 (referred to hereinafter as "UME").

Claims 5-9 and 15-22

Claims 5 and 15 recite, *inter alia*,

executing, ***by a rules manager***, one or more rules ***stored in a rules array, the rules including pointers to entries within the working budget database and entries within the reference budget database***, a definition of a test relationship that between the entries pointed to in the working budget and the entries pointed to in the reference budget and a definition of a response that is a function of the test relationship,
performing on the computer system ***an aggregation of the value of the received budget item with an entry of the working budget database*** to obtain an ***aggregated value of the entry in the working budget database***;

The applied prior art does not disclose rules as recited in the above recited claim language. As admitted in the Office Action at page 4, Zawadzki does not disclose rules containing pointers, definition of test relationships or a definition of a response. To overcome this deficiency, the Office asserts that the manual UME for the spreadsheet application Excel™ discloses the above-highlighted features.

However, UME discloses a function that is usable only within the context of worksheets or workbooks within the same application. As disclosed, the IF function is performed on cells C10 and D10. This is not the same as the claimed database entries that are stored in separate databases.

Neither Zawadzki nor UME disclose or suggest performing an aggregation in a working budget database as recited in the claims. Zawadzki merely depicts a user interface for displaying a budget to a user, and not the detailed working budget and reference databases recited in the claims.

Furthermore, the applied prior art does not disclose or suggest a rules manager or a rules array as recited in the independent claims.

Zawadzki and UME, either individually or in combination, does not disclose or suggest all of the features recited in independent claims 5 and 15. Claims 6-9 and 16-22 depend from claims 5 and 15, respectively. Claims 5-9 and 15-22 are allowable.

New Claim 23

New claim 23 recites a combination of features that are neither disclosed or suggested in the prior art as discussed above with respect to claims 5 and 15. Claim 23 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and favorable action in connection with this application. Applicants submit that all of the outstanding rejections have been overcome, and request withdrawal of the rejections of record. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 to Kenyon & Kenyon Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

PATENT

Att'y Dkt.: 11884/406801

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4419 to discuss any matter concerning this application. All claims are allowable. Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 16, 2008

/Martin E. Miller/

Martin E. Miller

Registration No. 56,022

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP
1500 K Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005-1257
Telephone: (202) 220-4200
Facsimile: (202) 220-4201